



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 20, 2013

Ms. Michele Tapia  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Carrollton  
1945 East Jackson Road  
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2013-22233

Dear Ms. Tapia:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 508234 (City ID No. 1431).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for the following information pertaining to RFP 12-023 Credit/Debit Card Processing and Merchant Services: (1) the winning proposal; (2) evaluation sheets; (3) evaluation scores; and (4) the best and final offer from the winning bidder. You indicate you have released information responsive to categories two and three of the request. You also indicate the city does not have any information responsive to category four of the request.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the submitted information, you state the proprietary interests of Vantiv, L.L.C. ("Vantiv") might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Vantiv of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office explaining why its information should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received arguments from Vantiv. Thus, we have considered its arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's responsibilities under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Additionally, under section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). Although you state the city received the request for information on September 30, 2013, we note the city sent a third-party notice to Vantiv regarding the request for information on September 10, 2013, thereby indicating the city had received the request for information prior to September 30, 2013. Further, the request for information, which you provided to our office, shows the request for information was sent to the city via e-mail on August 27, 2013. As the city has not provided our office with an accurate date of receipt, we assume the city received the request on the date it was e-mailed to the city. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Thus, the city was required to request a decision from this office by September 11, 2013, and to submit the information required by section 552.301(e) by September 18, 2013. However, the envelope in which you sent the request for a decision and some of the information required by section 552.301(e) was meter-marked October 2, 2013. *See id.* § 552.301(b), (e); *see also id.* § 552.308. The remaining information required by section 552.301(e) was submitted to our office in an envelope meter-marked December 3, 2013. *Id.* Therefore, we conclude the city failed to establish it complied with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005,

no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3, 325 at 2 (1982). Because third-party interests are involved in this instance, we will consider whether the submitted information must be released under the Act.

Vantiv asserts the information at issue should be withheld because the company expected confidentiality when the information was submitted to the city. Information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)–(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>2</sup> This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990)*. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983)*.

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also ORD 552 at 5*.

Upon review, we find Vantiv has established some of the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. As such, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, we find Vantiv has made only conclusory allegations the release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5*

---

<sup>2</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980)*.

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive of this information, we do not address the remaining arguments against its disclosure.

(1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find Vantiv has not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Vantiv demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3. We note, information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](#), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle R. Garza", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Michelle R. Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 508234

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jana K. Terry  
Counsel for Vantiv, LLC  
The Law Office of Jana Terry, PLLC  
13359 North Highway 183, #406-231  
Austin, Texas 78750  
(w/o enclosures)